IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. (Withdrawn) A method for providing analysis information for a decision, the method comprising:

developing a story line;

identifying at least one critical decision point within the story line;

characterizing each of the at least one critical decision point;

developing knowledge about each of the at least one critical decision point;

identifying each of the at least one critical decision point of relevance to the decision; and

providing the knowledge corresponding to each identified critical decision point.

2. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein developing a story line includes:

developing storyboard segments.

3. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 2, wherein the storyboard segments are developed around story line events.

4. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 2, further comprising:

validating aspects of the story line.

5. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the story line is developed using subject matter expertise.

6. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the story line is developed using historical precedent.

7. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the story line is developed using at least one selected from a group consisting of selecting a geographic location, scanning strategic environment, determining response resources, determining policies, and determining past incidents.

8. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein each of the at least one critical decision point is identified using subject matter expertise.

9. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein characterizing each of the at least one critical decision point includes:

using commercial software to map at least one potential decision path.

10. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein characterizing each of the at least one critical decision point further includes:

for each of the at least one potential decision path, mapping potential extended order effects.

11. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

integrating the story line with computer enterprise architecture.

12. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the story line includes a plurality of story line segments, the method further comprising:

preparing a movie presentation that portrays at least one of the plurality of story line segments.

13. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

integrating extended order visualization maps around each of the at least one decision point.

14. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein developing knowledge about each of the at least one critical decision point includes:

identifying at least one decision maker.

15. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 14, wherein developing knowledge about each of the at least one critical decision point includes:

identifying at least one domain expert.

16. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 15, further comprising:

assessing each of the at least one decision maker and each of the at least one domain expert.

17. (Withdrawn) A method for providing assistance for a decision, the method comprising:

developing a generic scenario analogous to the decision;

developing an automated enterprise architecture;

integrating the developed generic scenario and the developed automated enterprise architecture;

identifying at least one decision option for the decision;

prioritizing each of the at least one decision option; and

identifying at least one mitigating strategy for each of the at least one decision option.

18. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 17, wherein the generic scenario is developed based on science and expert input.

19. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 17, further comprising:

Application No.: 10/694,024
Attorney Docket No.: 028764-00002

identifying an extended order effect for each of the at least one decision option.

20. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 17, further comprising:

creating an analogous event library based on the identified at least one decision option and the identified at least one mitigating strategy.

21. (Withdrawn)   A system for providing assistance for a decision, the system comprising:

means for developing a generic scenario analogous to the decision;

means for developing an automated enterprise architecture;

means for integrating the developed generic scenario and the developed automated enterprise architecture;

means for identifying at least one decision option for the decision;

means for prioritizing each of the at least one decision option; and

means for identifying at least one mitigating strategy for each of the at least one decision option.

22. (Withdrawn)   A system for providing assistance for a decision, the system comprising:

a processor; and

a repository accessible by the processor;

wherein a generic scenario analogous to the decision is developed;

wherein an automated enterprise architecture is developed via the processor;

wherein the developed generic scenario and the developed automated enterprise architecture is integrated;

Application No.: 10/694,024
Attorney Docket No.: 028764-00002

wherein at least one decision option for the decision is identified;

wherein each of the at least one decision option is prioritized; and

wherein at least one mitigating strategy for each of the at least one decision

option is identified.

23. (canceled)

24. (Currently Amended) The method of claim [[23]] 26, wherein the bipolar

instrument is a Lichert scale.

25. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 23, wherein the output plurality of

possible outcomes comprises a chart.

26. (New) A method for developing a desired outcome of an emergency

situation, the method comprising:

using an epistemology to develop a range of possible scenarios for the

development of the emergency situation;

for each of the range of possible scenarios, determining a degree of applicability

for each of a plurality of cognitive frames of reference to the epistemology using a

bipolar instrument;

based on the determined degree of applicability for the plurality of cognitive

frames of reference for each of the range of possible scenarios, developing a plurality of

possible outcomes of the emergency situation; and

selecting a favorable outcome from the plurality of possible outcomes based on

desired outcome characteristics;

wherein the plurality of cognitive frames of reference includes at least two selected from a group consisting of linearity/non-linearity, reductionism/holism, certainty/uncertainty, reversibility/irreversibility and induction/deduction; and

wherein the bipolar instrument indicates applicability or non-applicability of the plurality of cognitive frames of reference.

27. (New) The method of claim 26, wherein the favorable outcome includes one selected from a group consisting of ameliorating terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction, ameliorating outbreaks of international regional conflicts, ameliorating outbreaks of asymmetric warfare, ameliorating attacks on critical infrastructure or facilities, ameliorating agro-terrorism, and ameliorating cyber-terrorism.

28. (New) The method of claim 27, further comprising:

taking measures to support selecting the favorable outcome.

29. (New) The method of claim 28, wherein taking measures to support selecting the favorable outcome includes at least one selected from a group consisting of using a consensus team decision model, and using simulation techniques.